

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-26 have been rejected. By way of this Amendment and Reply, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, 12, 15-17, 21-23, 25 and 26 have been amended. No new matter is added by way of these amendments. Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-26 will be pending in the present Application.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicant appreciates the examiner interview with Examiner Mapa of July 7, 2011, the Interview Summary of which is of record in the application. Applicant's representative explained that (1) the "access point" in Siddiqi cannot be reasonably interpreted as the recited "terminal" in the claims, and (2) the subnet mapping table in Siddiqi is continually changing and not based on pre-registered information.

With respect to issue (1), Examiner Mapa was of the opinion that the access point in Siddiqi could be interpreted as the claimed terminal because the term "terminal" is very broad and because paragraph [0070] of the published application indicates that the system is not necessarily triadic. Applicant appreciates the suggestions by Examiner Mapa to potentially overcome the current prior art rejections by replacing "terminal" with the more specific "end-user device", and to add the feature where the monitor apparatus, the access point, and the terminal are separate and independent devices. Applicant has now amended the claims to recite "a managed terminal list having addresses of pre-registered end-user devices, said end-user devices being targets of management." Moreover, while applicant has not amended the claims to recite that the monitor apparatus, the access point, and the terminal are separate and independent devices, applicant has made the amendment "where the access point and the end-user devices are separate and independent devices." Applicant believes that this amendment is sufficient to distinguish from Siddiqi, which does not disclose a terminal (end-user device) separate from its AP.

With respect to issue (2) Examiner Mapa was of the opinion that the claims do not specify that the terminals are pre-registered. Applicant appreciates the suggestions by Examiner Mapa to potentially overcome the current prior art rejections by adding “pre-registered” to the claims. In accordance with the suggestion, applicant has amended the claims to recite “a managed terminal list having addresses of pre-registered end-user devices.”

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-19 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of U.S. Patent No. 7,362,742 to Siddiqi et al. (“Siddiqi”) in view of U.S. 2003/0012202 to Fukutomi et al. (“Fukutomi”). Claims 6, 12, 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siddiqi in view of Fukutomi and further in view of U.S. 2005/0060576 to Kime et al. (“Kime”).

In light of the examiner interview, as discussed above, and the amendments to the claims to incorporate most of the claim amendment suggestions of Examiner Mapa to overcome the art of record, and in particular to distinguish from Siddiqi, applicant believes that the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under

37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 9/15/2011

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438